

## Lancaster Intelligencer.

MONDAY EVENING, DEC. 13, 1880.

## What the Issues Are.

The Philadelphia Press and Senator Conkling are placed in a very remarkable position before the country by the fact that Senator Bayard informed one of the Press editors prior to November 20, and advised Senator Conkling in two letters of Nov. 15 and 21, that the report was false of a speech made by him in October and published in the Press; and by the other fact that, notwithstanding, the Press on Dec. 11 published a letter dated Nov. 29, signed by Conkling, Davis, Boutwell and Arthur, which said that "up to this time no disclaimer or retraction by or on behalf of Mr. T. F. Bayard has appeared as far as we know."

The Press and Senator Conkling did know that Senator Bayard had made such a disclaimer, and they stand before the country as telling a deliberate lie, for the purpose of showing Senator Bayard to be a liar; or for some other secret purpose not now disclosed.

There does not seem to be any opportunity for the Press and Senator Conkling to escape from this position. Their idea probably is that Senator Bayard's statement to the Press editor that the Press report was false, and his similar declaration to Senator Conkling, accompanied with a statement of what he really did say, do not fully relieve Senator Conkling from the imputations of the speech, and that therefore they were able to say that he had not disclaimed them. But if they so thought they were bound to acknowledge what Mr. Bayard had disclaimed and to hold him responsible only for what he did not disclaim. This is clear to every man of sense and honor.

The Press, admitting the denial as Mr. Bayard shows he made it, undertakes to say that the issue is whether he did say it or no. That may be one issue; but there are two others which it and Senator Conkling have raised.

The one is whether they have lied deliberately and maliciously in suppressing their knowledge of Senator Bayard's denial, so far as it was made, and declaring and printing that no disclaimer or retraction had appeared on behalf of Mr. Bayard.

The other remaining issue is as to the conduct of Senator Conkling, so far as he was referred to by Mr. Bayard in his speech and is implicated in the Phelps, Dodge & Co. settlement by the record to which Senator Bayard drew his attention after he had declared his ignorance of it. Connected with this issue is the previous to the conduct of the other signers of the card, in hunting and capturing their part of the swag. This will be an interesting matter of investigation and discussion and should be entered into for the purpose of enlightening the dense ignorance of Senator Conkling. A committee of the Senate, Mr. Conkling evidently does not read the record as Senator Bayard does, and as every one else does. He should be given a chance to develop the facts, and while the Senate is about it, Senator Conkling ought to be allowed to show the exact truth about his shotgun encounter with Sprague. There is a general impression that the senator is not a good and moral man. He seems to think that he is. Give him a chance to prove it, rash as he seems to be to ask it. He would be more prudent to follow the example of Garfield, who only prays for oblivion for the past. He refrained from denying that he had committed perjury or from indicting the numerous newspapers that have charged it on him; though he did waken up at last to complain against one that accused him of a new piece of lying. He wants us to understand that he has outgrown the habit; and that if he perjured himself in 1873, he don't lie in 1880. Conkling on the other hand bids fair to prove that he is not growing in grace. His present lie is not a healthy moral look. There is no danger of his growing too good for the company of Garfield, Blaine and Cameron. Perhaps he is only anxious to show that he is wicked enough to suit the temper of the times that have put a perjurer in the presidency. He has no need to be anxious; nobody will deny it.

## The Ohio Idea.

It seems to be almost as good a thing to be married to an Ohio girl as to be an Ohio man when you go to Mr. Hayes for office. General Hazen gets the signal service generalship because he married Wash, McLean's daughter, and General Miles because his wife is the daughter of Judge Sherman and the sister of Mrs. Don Cameron. Neither appointment ought to have been made, and neither would have been but for the Ohio wives and their family influence. General Miles is a first-class soldier, but there are other good soldiers ahead of him on the list who were justly entitled first to promotion. And General Ord, though over 62 years old and, therefore, subject to retirement, is in excellent physical and mental condition, fit for any duty, and did not wish to go out of active service. He was compelled to walk the plank, while generals much older and more physically incapable are permitted to remain on the active list. There is Sherman, himself, who sticks to his soft place, notwithstanding the hints he has been getting to give some other fellow a chance; and McDowell, of Bull Run memory, who has never distinguished himself anywhere but at the dinner table. Gen. Ord has good reason to complain of his treatment, and the telegraph announces that he shook the dust of Texas off his feet as soon as he received notice of his retirement, and went over to Mexico, where his son-in-law, Gen. Trevino, is secretary of war. We are glad to know that the fine old general was able to take advantage of the Ohio idea and place himself in Mexico under such auspicious circumstances. A wife, we are learning to know, is a very excellent family lever. With proper anchorage she can boost any of her family to an agreeable elevation. Mr. Hayes deserves well of the country for demonstrating to its young men the great advantage of marriage—to a

properly anchored wife. Hazen would have been cashiered long ago but for Mrs. Hazen; for they could not have avoided dismissing him if he had ever been court-martialed for running away at the battle of Shiloh. General Miles would have had no chance whatever of getting his stars but for the good wife, and General Ord would have come home to a useless and melancholy old age but for his daughter. Now the old hero has a career opened to him which he has the vigor to make conspicuous and useful. Mexico is going to attract a great deal of the world's attention in the coming years, and we know no place were an energetic life is likely to be better rewarded. Political affairs seem to be now settled there and every opportunity is ready to be afforded to the effort of capital and enterprise. And there is reason to foresee in the early future of our own country such serious disturbance of its industry, through political convulsion, as will send many of its people over into Mexico in search of a quiet as well as profitable life.

## PERSONAL.

It is said of Queen Victoria that she is becoming capricious.

JOHN W. MACKEY, with his wife and brother-in-law, Court Telfer, will go up the Nile this winter.

LORD BEACONSFIELD was the guest of the queen at Windsor for three days last week. Mr. GLADSTONE was also invited, but ill-health obliged him to decline the honor.

The partnership of the French ROTHSCHILDS, which expired on the 1st of November, has been renewed. It is to end in 1905. The capital of the house is fixed at \$10,000,000, of which Barons Alphonse, Gustave and Edmond Rothschild are each to furnish one-third.

The engagement that has been so long talked of between Mr. FRANK POTTER and Miss Key, of Baltimore, is announced at last. Mr. Potter is one of the sons of the late Bishop Potter by his second wife, and the bride-elect is a daughter of the late Barton Key, who was shot in the streets of Washington by Gen. Daniel Sickles about twenty years ago.

The Cotnam hunt at Oakham, Rutland, England, of which Mr. JAMES GONDO BENNETT is now master, has a pack of sixty couples, and is classed with those known as the levantine packs. During the hunting season in England, which is now in full swing, more than £1,000,000 is expended, and it is not unusual to have from 800 to 1,000 meets each week. The season begins about the 1st of November, previous to which cub hunting is in order, and lasts from five to six months with occasional interruptions from frost.

ABELIA PATTI reappeared in opera in Madrid on Saturday night, after an interval of seventeen years. She was born in Madrid. Her parents were obscure artists in the opera company there in 1844. Even gala nights never witnessed so full and fashionable a house. It was graced by the presence of royalty. Every part of the theatre was densely packed. Twenty-five dollars were asked for stalls and \$4 for single seats in the upper gallery. The applause was immense and the stage was covered with floral tributes.

Mr. THOMPSON, secretary of the navy, has decided definitely to accept the chairmanship of the American committee on the Panama canal, with a salary of \$25,000 a year. He has notified Mr. Hayes of his intention to resign from the cabinet, but he has not yet prepared the formal letter. Mr. Hayes assured him that his resignation would be accepted with sincere regret. It is probable that no change will be made for a fortnight. In the meantime Mr. Thompson will arrange the government business and Mr. Hayes will have an opportunity to select a new secretary of the navy for ten weeks' service.

Several days ago an order was issued by the postmaster of Washington requiring all employees of the city postoffice, including officers, clerks, messengers, etc., to appear in uniform and brass buttons. The postmaster sent a tailor to the different employees to measure them for their liveries. Some of them objected to the proceedings, declaring that they had all the clothes they wanted, and that if they required more they preferred to go to their own tailor. Some of the most important clerks rebelled, but it is understood the postmaster intimated that they must either wear the uniform or leave their situations. The clerks say they will bring the matter to the attention of Congress and see where the postmaster gets his power.

MADAM THIERS is dead. She was the widow of the late President Thiers, of the French republic, to whom she was married just before the revolution of 1849, being then in her seventeenth year. Her father, M. Desme, a stock broker, had intimate business relations with M. Thiers when that illustrious historian and statesman was a young man. Madame Thiers and her elder sister, Mile Desme, acquired social distinction in Paris many years ago through their remarkable intellectual brilliancy leading them great service. After the death of her husband Mme. Thiers devoted herself to his memory, spending much time in the preparation of unfinished works for the press and taking a keen interest in the election of proper successors to his chairs in the several academies which compose the French Institute. She caught a severe cold recently, when the Thiers statue was dedicated at St. Germain-en-Laye, and her illness was aggravated by the reflection that many of her husband's professed admirers were not present at the ceremony.

## MINOR TOPICS.

WALTER SAVAGE LANDOR observed of Byron's poetry that it was as bitter as gall and original as sin.

The Dean of Chichester said in the Cambridge university pulpit: "For my part, I am quite content to seek my ancestors in the garden called Eden; let others if they choose look for theirs in the garden called zoological."

A RESOLUTION is to be introduced at an early day in Parliament to provide against obstruction and filibustering by the Land Leaguers. In some parts of Ireland the Land League hold their own courts, and administer justice. The controversy in the cabinet over the question of the advisability of coercive measures against Ireland continues, and it is feared may cause a

split in the Liberal party. The land question has spread into England and English landlords are becoming alarmed at the increased number of land organizations among their tenants.

DINNERS in masks are the latest novelties in London entertainments, and, in spite of the deadness of the present season, one has already been given by a young and beautiful woman, who writes the names of royalty upon her visiting list, but who is not a professional beauty. At this novel festivity, all the guests were completely and concealingly masked, and were not even required to disclose their identity before their departure. The conversation was lively, and the candid expressions of opinion rather embarrassing to those who were obliged to listen to a very free discussion of themselves and their affairs, without the possibility of contradiction or defence.

THERE is a good deal of feeling between the present administration and the friends of General Garfield regarding the retirement of certain justices of the supreme court. Mr. Hayes desires that Justices Strong, Swayne, Clifford and Hunt shall retire before the 4th of March next, so that he may name their successors.

The friends of Garfield, particularly Blaine, Conkling and Edmunds, do not want any retirements until after March. It is stated that Justice Strong will occupy his seat in this court to-day for the last time and that he will accept a position as counsel for the Philadelphia & Reading railroad. Mr. Hayes wants to place Attorney General Devens on the supreme bench before he gives up his presidency and possibly he will nominate him in place of Strong. This will offend Don Cameron, Senator Blaine and Senator Edmunds, and no doubt they will do all they can to defeat the nomination. A very pretty fight is in the future on this subject.

## A TRIPLE LYNCHING.

Three Hounds Laid for the Murder of a Young Married Woman.

The Charleston News and Courier has received details of the murder of Mrs. Kennedy in Clarendon county, S.C., and of the consequent lynching of three negroes. Last Sunday Mr. Thomas Kennedy, living near Santee, intending to visit Charleston, went over to his father's house, a short distance from his own, to ask his mother to stay with his wife during his absence. Mr. Kennedy's wife was formerly Miss Kennedy, daughter of a prominent family of South Carolina, and had been married about a year. She was a young lady of only 19 or 20 years of age, intelligent, refined and highly respected. When her husband left she shut the door and sat by a window to write a letter to her mother. As she sat there she saw in the yard Joe Barnes, a colored boy about 16 years old, who had been employed by Mr. Kennedy the previous week. This boy had been induced by two negroes living in the neighborhood to write a letter to her mother. As she sat there she saw in the yard Joe Barnes, a colored boy about 16 years old, who had been employed by Mr. Kennedy the previous week. This boy had been induced by two negroes living in the neighborhood to write a letter to her mother. As she sat there she saw in the yard Joe Barnes, a colored boy about 16 years old, who had been employed by Mr. Kennedy the previous week. This boy had been induced by two negroes living in the neighborhood to write a letter to her mother.

Mr. Kennedy's wife was formerly Miss Kennedy, daughter of a prominent family of South Carolina, and had been married about a year. She was a young lady of only 19 or 20 years of age, intelligent, refined and highly respected. When her husband left she shut the door and sat by a window to write a letter to her mother. As she sat there she saw in the yard Joe Barnes, a colored boy about 16 years old, who had been employed by Mr. Kennedy the previous week. This boy had been induced by two negroes living in the neighborhood to write a letter to her mother.

Several days ago an order was issued by the postmaster of Washington requiring all employees of the city postoffice, including officers, clerks, messengers, etc., to appear in uniform and brass buttons. The postmaster sent a tailor to the different employees to measure them for their liveries. Some of them objected to the proceedings, declaring that they had all the clothes they wanted, and that if they required more they preferred to go to their own tailor. Some of the most important clerks rebelled, but it is understood the postmaster intimated that they must either wear the uniform or leave their situations. The clerks say they will bring the matter to the attention of Congress and see where the postmaster gets his power.

MADAM THIERS is dead. She was the widow of the late President Thiers, of the French republic, to whom she was married just before the revolution of 1849, being then in her seventeenth year. Her father, M. Desme, a stock broker, had intimate business relations with M. Thiers when that illustrious historian and statesman was a young man. Madame Thiers and her elder sister, Mile Desme, acquired social distinction in Paris many years ago through their remarkable intellectual brilliancy leading them great service. After the death of her husband Mme. Thiers devoted herself to his memory, spending much time in the preparation of unfinished works for the press and taking a keen interest in the election of proper successors to his chairs in the several academies which compose the French Institute. She caught a severe cold recently, when the Thiers statue was dedicated at St. Germain-en-Laye, and her illness was aggravated by the reflection that many of her husband's professed admirers were not present at the ceremony.

MADAM THIERS is dead. She was the widow of the late President Thiers, of the French republic, to whom she was married just before the revolution of 1849, being then in her seventeenth year. Her father, M. Desme, a stock broker, had intimate business relations with M. Thiers when that illustrious historian and statesman was a young man. Madame Thiers and her elder sister, Mile Desme, acquired social distinction in Paris many years ago through their remarkable intellectual brilliancy leading them great service. After the death of her husband Mme. Thiers devoted herself to his memory, spending much time in the preparation of unfinished works for the press and taking a keen interest in the election of proper successors to his chairs in the several academies which compose the French Institute. She caught a severe cold recently, when the Thiers statue was dedicated at St. Germain-en-Laye, and her illness was aggravated by the reflection that many of her husband's professed admirers were not present at the ceremony.

MADAM THIERS is dead. She was the widow of the late President Thiers, of the French republic, to whom she was married just before the revolution of 1849, being then in her seventeenth year. Her father, M. Desme, a stock broker, had intimate business relations with M. Thiers when that illustrious historian and statesman was a young man. Madame Thiers and her elder sister, Mile Desme, acquired social distinction in Paris many years ago through their remarkable intellectual brilliancy leading them great service. After the death of her husband Mme. Thiers devoted herself to his memory, spending much time in the preparation of unfinished works for the press and taking a keen interest in the election of proper successors to his chairs in the several academies which compose the French Institute. She caught a severe cold recently, when the Thiers statue was dedicated at St. Germain-en-Laye, and her illness was aggravated by the reflection that many of her husband's professed admirers were not present at the ceremony.

MADAM THIERS is dead. She was the widow of the late President Thiers, of the French republic, to whom she was married just before the revolution of 1849, being then in her seventeenth year. Her father, M. Desme, a stock broker, had intimate business relations with M. Thiers when that illustrious historian and statesman was a young man. Madame Thiers and her elder sister, Mile Desme, acquired social distinction in Paris many years ago through their remarkable intellectual brilliancy leading them great service. After the death of her husband Mme. Thiers devoted herself to his memory, spending much time in the preparation of unfinished works for the press and taking a keen interest in the election of proper successors to his chairs in the several academies which compose the French Institute. She caught a severe cold recently, when the Thiers statue was dedicated at St. Germain-en-Laye, and her illness was aggravated by the reflection that many of her husband's professed admirers were not present at the ceremony.

MADAM THIERS is dead. She was the widow of the late President Thiers, of the French republic, to whom she was married just before the revolution of 1849, being then in her seventeenth year. Her father, M. Desme, a stock broker, had intimate business relations with M. Thiers when that illustrious historian and statesman was a young man. Madame Thiers and her elder sister, Mile Desme, acquired social distinction in Paris many years ago through their remarkable intellectual brilliancy leading them great service. After the death of her husband Mme. Thiers devoted herself to his memory, spending much time in the preparation of unfinished works for the press and taking a keen interest in the election of proper successors to his chairs in the several academies which compose the French Institute. She caught a severe cold recently, when the Thiers statue was dedicated at St. Germain-en-Laye, and her illness was aggravated by the reflection that many of her husband's professed admirers were not present at the ceremony.

## BAYARD'S SPEECH AT DOVER.

A Sharp Correspondence With Senator Conkling.

The following statement and the appended letter have been furnished for publication:

The publication in the Philadelphia Press, signed by C. A. Arthur, Roscoe Conkling, George S. Boutwell and Noah Davis, dated in New York, Nov. 29, 1880, but not published until Dec. 11, renders it proper that the subjoined letters should also be published. The dates of these letters and their contents fully explain them, and no other correspondence has passed between any of the signers of the card in the Press and myself. Mr. F. A. Burr, one of the editors of the Press, had received in Philadelphia the letters referred to, and I stated the falsity and malice of the report of my speech at Dover, which had been published in the Press of Oct. 29. After the foregoing correspondence, no further statement, on my part, was necessary. An interview with me nearly three weeks elapsed before the parties published the card alluded to, in which they denounce as false the alleged report of a speech which weeks before I had stated to be untrue. These facts are submitted to the judgment of honorable men.

T. F. BAYARD.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Dec. 12, 1880.

UTICA, N. Y., Nov. 13, 1880.

DEAR SIR: I took attention to the following newspaper report of remarks alleged to have been made by you in a public speech at Dover, Del., near the end of the recent canvass:

"I cannot but claim he is misrepresented, and I am in writing report of the language he used: 'When that interview took place very distinguished gentlemen were present, the senior senator from New York among others, Mr. Conkling, also Mr. Roscoe Conkling, the collector, Mr. Arthur, the spy or special agent they called him—all were present. Mr. Boutwell, the distinguished financier, who was secretary of the treasury, was also there. And they all stood about this unhappy merchant, who had given his \$25,000 subscription to Gen. Grant; this president of the Young Men's Christian association, this member of the Union League, and this president of the Chamber of Commerce. He thought that would be a good deal of money. They took from that man's pocket in one sum \$267,000 in money, and they divided it among themselves. [Great laughter.] Gentlemen this is no exaggeration or figure of speech. There it stands upon the record, and I want to tell you it is a thing of which I have knowledge and means of knowledge.'"

The extract is cut from the Philadelphia Press of Friday, October 29, 1880. The *Sentinel*, published at Dover, on the 30th of October, contains the same report in substance. The appearance of these two publications in journals near you, and their having gone thus far without correction, or, what I trust, seem sufficient excuse for bringing them to your notice. Will you please inform me whether you did make this statement in form or substance? It is hardly necessary to add that this inquiry is not meant to imply that I suppose you did, or would make such an utterance. My purpose is to adopt the most accurate and convenient mode of setting right an injustice, greater, perhaps, to you than to others.

Your obedient servant,

ROSCOE CONKLING.

Hon. THOMAS F. BAYARD, United States Senator, Wilmington, Del.

WILMINGTON, Nov. 15, 1880.

DEAR SIR: I have just received your letter, dated the 13th inst., accompanied by a newspaper cutting, purporting to be an extract from a report of a public speech made by me at Dover, in this state, "near the end of the recent canvass." I made but one speech at Dover, and spoke then without notes. Until I received your letter, I never saw any report of my speech made or published. The Press, from which you tell me you cut the extract, is a Philadelphia paper, and the *Sentinel* is a Philadelphia paper, and I have never seen a copy since. Reading for the first time the extract you send me, it appears to me so grossly inaccurate as to cause the belief that it could not have been written by an honest person. I remember well speaking of Phelps, Dodge & Co., and of the proceeding under which a great sum of money (\$270,000) was wrongfully taken from their pockets. I described and denounced in severe terms the "money system," and the share which in that system the collector, the spy, the naval officer, and the informer (Jayne, or Herre), and stated that "the senior senator from New York, Mr. Conkling, was understood to have received compensation, as their counsel, from Messrs. Phelps, Dodge & Co., for their services and assistance in the transaction;" also that my authority for this statement was derived from a document published by one of the houses of Congress, accompanied by testimony made in open debate on the floor of the House and in my knowledge, contradicted. I believe I also referred to a publication by William P. Wood, an ex-treasury official, made in the New York Sun, Oct. 27, 1880, giving his account of the Phelps, Dodge & Co. case, and the proceeding under which a great sum of money (\$270,000) was wrongfully taken from their pockets. I described and denounced in severe terms the "money system," and the share which in that system the collector, the spy, the naval officer, and the informer (Jayne, or Herre), and stated that "the senior senator from New York, Mr. Conkling, was understood to have received compensation, as their counsel, from Messrs. Phelps, Dodge & Co., for their services and assistance in the transaction;" also that my authority for this statement was derived from a document published by one of the houses of Congress, accompanied by testimony made in open debate on the floor of the House and in my knowledge, contradicted. I believe I also referred to a publication by William P. Wood, an ex-treasury official, made in the New York Sun, Oct. 27, 1880, giving his account of the Phelps, Dodge & Co. case, and the proceeding under which a great sum of money (\$270,000) was wrongfully taken from their pockets.

On Friday night three miles from Colonia station, on the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific railroad, thirteen miles east of St. Louis, Mo., a wealthy farmer and an old resident, was found dead in his bed, his skull crushed in and his face and body horribly disfigured. Beside him was his wife, unconscious and probably injured about the head from wounds inflicted by a sharp instrument. A short distance from the house a spade, battered and bloody, was discovered. There was quite a sum of money in the house untouched. It is believed that an old grudge passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has made the rule absolute and disallowed the attempted amendment. It will be remembered that the act of June 11, 1879, authorized and required courts to permit amendments "consecutive to justice" to be made, in any stage of the proceedings, in case of "any mechanics claim or lien filed according to existing laws." In the above case the lien was filed in March, 1879, and the amendments sought to be made by virtue of the law passed in June. The question involved was whether the language of the act referred to liens prior to its passage or only those subsequently filed. The lower courts were divided. Common pleas judges in Mercer and Philadelphia held that the act was not retroactive, and accordingly our court struck off in amendment the words "or those subsequently filed." The court has